foreign to *Gestalt* theory: * The organism is individualized and unified in such a way as to give it as one whole a measure of determinative power for its own welfare over each of its parts.'

And in this later statement he seems to soften his indictment of the geneticists, citing with approval T. H. Morgan as follows : ' While each gene may have a specific effect on certain parts of the body, it may also have othelr effects on other parts of the body. Furthermore, each organ or character is the end-result of the action of many genes. In fact, each part may be said to be the end-product of the activity of all the genes.' On this he comments:

' If each part of the completed organism is the end-product of the activity of all the genes, even though each gene may have a specific effect on certain parts of the body, some power must be operative other than those possessed by the genes, each acting all by itself, to produce the results we actually see.' And his answer to the question, What is that power ? is ᶜ The organism as a whole \

Ritter insists on such facts as that in certain eggs the first stage of development consists in a flowing within the cytoplasm of three parts, distinguishable by their colours, into new positions, where they generate respectively endoderm, mesoderm, and ectoderm. He finds a striking illustration of the wholeness and the subordination of parts to the whole in certain simple segmented organisms, such as Amphioxus or Lancelet, the simplest of the vertebrates. It is of a slender fish-like shape, made up of a linear series of segments all very much alike,

but differing in the diameters of the successive segments, which are smoothly graded in such a way as to give the regular geometrical shape of the whole.

When one inquires in what sense exactly is the organism